

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name:	Gallatin County Logan Landfill Exchange
Proposed Implementation Date:	9/1/2018
Proponent:	Gallatin County & DNRC, Bozeman Unit
Location:	Township 1 North, Range 3 East, Section 6, Township 2 North, Range 2E, Section 36 & Township 1 North, Range 2 East, Section 1
Trust:	Common Schools & University of Montana
County:	Gallatin

I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

The Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation (DNRC) Trust Land Management Division (TLMD), Bozeman Unit and Gallatin County are proposing a land exchange in relation to the Logan Landfill operated by the Gallatin County Solid Waste District. The State lands proposed to be included in this exchange are in Township 1 North, Range 3 East, Section 6 (627.31 acres) and Township 2 North, Range 2E, Lot A, S $\frac{1}{2}$ S $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, S $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, S $\frac{1}{2}$ Section 36 (8.82 acres). The Gallatin County lands proposed for exchange are in Township 1 North, Range 2 East, Section 1 (620.9 acres)

The State lands involved in the proposal are held by the State of Montana for the support of the University of Montana and the Common Schools (*Enabling Act of February 22, 1889*). The Board of Land Commissioners (Land Board) and the DNRC are required by law to administer these State Trust Lands to produce the largest measure of reasonable and legitimate return over the long run for these institutions [*1972 Montana Constitution, Article X, Section 11; Montana Code Annotated (MCA) 77-1-202*].

The State lands in Township 1 North, Range 3 East, Section 6, are currently encumbered by an 80-acre easement for a landfill held by Gallatin County and managed by the Gallatin County Solid Waste District a 12.02 acre easement for Highway 90, the remainder is classified as grazing and managed as a State grazing lease. The State lands in Township 2 North, Range 2E, Lot A, S $\frac{1}{2}$ S $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, S $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, S $\frac{1}{2}$ Section 36, are classified as commercial and leased to the Gallatin County Solid Waste District as a scale facility (to be referred to as "State Ownership"). Gallatin counties lands in Township 1 North, Range 2 East, Section 1, are managed for agriculture and grazing (to be referred to as "County Ownership").

The proposal is for the Gallatin Solid Waste District to exchange their adjacent property to the west of the landfill to DNRC for University of Montana and Common School Trust Lands on which the landfill and scale house are currently located, these lands are of approximately equal value. This exchange would allow both DNRC and the Gallatin Solid Waste District to consolidate their holdings and provide for improved management and access to their respective lands. Improved management of these lands would benefit the Trust beneficiaries, Gallatin Solid Waste District, the public and the natural resources.

II. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED:

Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project. List number of individuals contacted, number of responses received, and newspapers in which notices were placed and for how long. Briefly summarize issues received from the public.

October 29, 2014 – Mailed scoping notice to surrounding landowners and Government officials with 1 month comment period.

October 30 & November 13, 2014 – A Legal advertisement was published in the Bozeman Daily Chronicle requesting scoping comments with a 1 month comment period.

December 15, 2014 – State of Montana board of land commissioners meeting for preliminary approval, preliminary approval received.

January 9, 2018 – Gallatin County Commission Meeting. The Gallatin County Commissioners approved the Agreement to Initiate a land exchange with the State of Montana, Trust Lands Division.

January 10, 2018 – The Bozeman Daily Chronicle published an article, “County, state to trade land for dumpsite”

January 19, 2018 – The Bozeman Daily Chronicle published an article, “Gallatin County on track to swap land for dumpsite this year”. Within this article notification was provided for a public meeting to be held by the State of Montana and Gallatin County on the land exchange at the Gallatin County Commission Meeting on February 6, 2018.

January 22, 2018 – Mailed scoping & public meeting notice to surrounding landowners and Government officials with comments due March 1, 2018.

January 23 & January 30, 2018 – A Legal advertisement was published in the Bozeman Daily Chronicle notifying the public of the public meeting and scoping request for comments associated with the proposal.

February 6, 2018, 9:00 AM – Public Meeting at the Gallatin County Commission Room to present the project to the public and receive comments.

3 comments were received, no new issues of concern were identified. Issues identified through the comment process will be addressed in this Environmental Checklist

2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:
Examples: cost-share agreement with U.S. Forest Service, 124 Permit, 3A Authorization, Air Quality Major Open Burning Permit.

No other Agencies with jurisdiction.

3. ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT:
Describe alternatives considered and, if applicable, provide brief description of how the alternatives were developed. List alternatives that were considered but eliminated from further analysis and why.

Alternative A – Execute the land exchange with Gallatin County allowing both DNRC and the Gallatin Solid Waste District to consolidate their holdings and provide for improved management and access to their respective lands.

Alternative B – Do not exchange land with Gallatin County. The State would maintain surface ownership of the Gallatin County land fill and continue grazing on the remainder and Gallatin county would utilize their land to the west for future operations.

III. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

- *RESOURCES* potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.
- Explain *POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS* following each resource heading.
- Enter "NONE" If no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.

4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE:

Consider the presence of fragile, compactable or unstable soils. Identify unusual geologic features. Specify any special reclamation considerations. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to soils.

The USDA soil survey for Gallatin County indicates the soils are classified as Chinook-Kalsted Sandy Loam, Chinook Fine Sandy Loam, Kalsted Sandy Loam and Amesha Loam.

Alternative A – A detailed Agricultural productivity report will be developed to compare the economic potential of both parcels to adequately compare the agricultural and grazing production potential of both the State Parcel and the County Parcel.

Alternative B – The portion of State Ownership that is not encumbered by the landfill or ancillary landfill uses is being leased for grazing and would continue to be used for grazing into the future. The County Ownership has both small grain agricultural production and grazing as primary uses. If the County was not able to acquire the State land future landfill activities would likely displace the agricultural production and grazing currently to accommodate landfill expansion.

5. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION:

Identify important surface or groundwater resources. Consider the potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to water resources.

There are 3 drainages on State Ownership which are ephemeral, but when active could contribute to the Gallatin River. On County Ownership there are 4 ephemeral drainages 2 of which enter onto State Ownership and all of which could contribute to the Gallatin River when active.

On State Ownership in the SE ¼ SE ¼ there is a ditch, the Warm Spring Canal, which flows in the spring and summer.

The Gallatin county Solid Waste District and Montana DEQ are monitoring a landfill leachate (solvent plume) discovered in 1998 through groundwater well monitoring at the landfill. The solvent plume is actively contained with Gallatin County mitigation measures in compliance with DEQ standards and mitigation plan.

Alternative A – With a change in owner ship Gallatin County Solid Waste District would be expected to expand the landfill to the south in the future on the land acquired from the State. This process would be preceded by an environmental study and regulation by the Montana Department of Environmental Quality, including potential impacts to surface and ground water. Prior to making application to expand landfill facilities management of the land would be expected to continue as it has under State ownership with effects on surface and ground water remaining the same.

If the land owned by Gallatin County is acquired by the State of Montana through this exchange, the lands will be managed for their highest and best use to the benefit of the trustee. The land will be classified by DNRC as

agricultural lands with current management expected to remain in agricultural production and grazing. Under this scenario changes to both surface and ground water quality would not be expected to change.

Alternative B – With no change in ownership Gallatin County Solid Waste District would be expected to expand the landfill to the west in the future on the land it currently owns. This process would be preceded by an environmental study and regulation by the Montana Department of Environmental Quality, including potential impacts to surface and ground water.

With no change in ownership the State of Montana would continue managing the land for grazing as it does currently and no change would be expected. Gallatin County Solid Waste District would continue to monitor and manage the landfill easement along with the monitoring programs for groundwater associated with the landfill.

6. AIR QUALITY:

What pollutants or particulate would be produced (i.e. particulate matter from road use or harvesting, slash pile burning, prescribed burning, etc)? Identify the Airshed and Impact Zone (if any) according to the Montana/Idaho Airshed Group. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to air quality.

The Parcels are located adjacent to Interstate 90, the State ownership has an active land fill on it and the Gallatin County Ownership in actively farmed, active agricultural activity surrounds both parcels. Landfill operations increase particulate throughout the year & agricultural operations on and around the parcels create an increase in airborne particulate during planting and harvest operations.

Alternatives A & B - Land management activities on Gallatin County land and the State of Montana land are similar and would continue as is except for the location of future landfill activities, which would be expected to move south of current operations if the exchange is executed or west if the exchange isn't executed. At the time Gallatin County Solid Waste District proposes landfill expansion a MEPA evaluation will be required to address landfill activities and impacts specifically.

No notable change would be expected due to either land ownership alternative.

7. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY:

What changes would the action cause to vegetative communities? Consider rare plants or cover types that would be affected. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to vegetation.

The Montana Natural Heritage Program lists Annual Indian Paintbrush and Idaho Sedge as plant species of concern in the vicinity. The State Ownership east of the landfill was farmed until 1987 then planted to crested wheat and leased for grazing and the 80-acre landfill easement has been managed as a land fill since the early 1970s. The North half of the County Ownership is currently farmed for small grains and the remainder has been used for grazing.

Alternatives A & B - Land management activities on Gallatin County land and the State of Montana land are similar and would continue as is except for the location of future landfill activities, which would be expected to move south of current operations if the exchange is executed or west if the exchange isn't executed. At the time Gallatin County Solid Waste District proposes landfill expansion a MEPA evaluation will be required to address landfill activities and impacts specifically.

No notable change would be expected due to either land ownership alternative.

8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS:

Consider substantial habitat values and use of the area by wildlife, birds or fish. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to fish and wildlife.

Current agricultural use of the land on both ownerships provide seasonal habitat for fauna such as insects, small animals (which are prey for raptors, fox, and coyote), deer, and field birds are present on the agricultural lands. The landfill operations support numerous bird species especially scavenger birds near the landfill including crows, magpies and gulls.

Alternatives A & B - Land management activities on Gallatin County land and the State of Montana land are similar and would continue as is except for the location of future landfill activities, which would be expected to move south of current operations if the exchange is executed or west if the exchange isn't executed. At the time Gallatin County Solid Waste District proposes landfill expansion a MEPA evaluation will be required to address landfill activities and impacts specifically.

No notable change would be expected due to either land ownership alternative.

9. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES:

Consider any federally listed threatened or endangered species or habitat identified in the project area. Determine effects to wetlands. Consider Sensitive Species or Species of special concern. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to these species and their habitat.

The Montana Natural Heritage Program lists the Bald Eagle, Great Blue Heron, Golden Eagle and Greater Short-Horned Lizard and animal Species of Concern and Annual Indian Paintbrush and Idaho Sedge as plant species of concern.

Alternatives A & B - Land management activities on Gallatin County land and the State of Montana land are similar and would continue as is except for the location of future landfill activities, which would be expected to move south of current operations if the exchange is executed or west if the exchange isn't executed. At the time Gallatin County Solid Waste District proposes landfill expansion a MEPA evaluation will be required to address landfill activities and impacts specifically.

No notable change would be expected due to either land ownership alternative.

10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:

Identify and determine direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to historical, archaeological or paleontological resources.

The DNRC archaeologist conducted a Class III cultural and paleontological resources inventory of Section 6, T1N R3E. A lithic scatter (24GA1757), an abandoned series of ditches (24GA1758), an actively used irrigation ditch (24GA1860), an abandoned road segment and bridge/culvert remains (24GA1968), and a small historic trash dump (24GA1969) were identified. The DNRC has consulted with the SHPO and determined that sites 24GA1757, 24GA1758, 24GA1968, and 24GA1969 are ineligible for listing the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). In contrast, site 24GA1860 (The Moreland Ditch) is eligible for listing in the NR. Because site 24GA1860 will not be disturbed or otherwise modified with future landfill expansion, the land exchange will result in No Effect to Heritage Properties as defined under the Montana State Antiquities Act. A formal report of findings has been prepared and is on file with the DNRC and the Montana State Historic Preservation Officer.

11. AESTHETICS:

Determine if the project is located on a prominent topographic feature, or may be visible from populated or scenic areas. What level of noise, light or visual change would be produced? Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to aesthetics.

The most obvious feature on the State land from Interstate 90 is the Gallatin County Landfill. Currently the landfill is operating on an 80-acre easement in the northwest corner of the State section adjacent to I-90. The remainder of the State and County land is managed as grazing or cultivated agriculture, which is the same as the surrounding land use.

Alternative A – If the land is exchanged with Gallatin County, landfill operations would be expected to move south and their visual impact would be reduced from Interstate 90 with the decreased proximity to the interstate and the revegetation of the current site, but the new activities may be visible to a few homesites to the southeast.

Alternative B – If the land is not exchanged the landfill operations would be expected to move onto Gallatin counties ownership to the west and would remain proximate to Interstate 90 where it would continue to be obvious, but would probably have little visual effect on the homesites to the southeast.

12. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY:

Determine the amount of limited resources the project would require. Identify other activities nearby that the project would affect. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to environmental resources.

Other than the landfill this land is managed as grazing and cultivated agriculture and the lands surrounding it are managed in a similar manner.

Alternatives A & B - Land management activities on Gallatin County land and the State of Montana land are similar and would continue as is except for the location of future landfill activities, which would be expected to move south of current operations if the exchange is executed or west if the exchange isn't executed. At the time Gallatin County Solid Waste District proposes landfill expansion a MEPA evaluation will be required to address landfill activities and impacts specifically.

No notable change would be expected due to either land ownership alternative.

13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA:

List other studies, plans or projects on this tract. Determine cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of current private, state or federal actions in the analysis area, and from future proposed state actions in the analysis area that are under MEPA review (scoped) or permitting review by any state agency.

Montana Department of Environmental Quality – State of Montana Solid Waste Management System License Renewal Certificate, License Number 158

Multi-Sector General Permit For Storm Water Discharges Associated with Industrial Activity – NOI Number MTR000358

Montana DEQ Corrective Measures Assessment – Approved December 22, 2006

IV. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION

- *RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.*
- *Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.*
- *Enter "NONE" If no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.*

14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY:

Identify any health and safety risks posed by the project.

Alternatives A & B - Land management activities on Gallatin County land and the State of Montana land are similar and would continue as is except for the location of future landfill activities, which would be expected to move south of current operations if the exchange is executed or west if the exchange isn't executed. At the time Gallatin County Solid Waste District proposes landfill expansion a MEPA evaluation will be required to address landfill activities and impacts specifically.

No effects to human health and safety would be expected due to either land ownership alternative.

15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURE ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION:

Identify how the project would add to or alter these activities.

Currently these lands support grazing, small grain production and activities associated with the management of a landfill.

Alternatives A & B - Land management activities on Gallatin County land and the State of Montana land are similar and would continue as is except for the location of future landfill activities, which would be expected to move south of current operations if the exchange is executed or west if the exchange isn't executed. At the time Gallatin County Solid Waste District proposes landfill expansion a MEPA evaluation will be required to address landfill activities and impacts specifically.

No notable change would be expected due to either land ownership alternative.

16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT:

Estimate the number of jobs the project would create, move or eliminate. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to the employment market.

These lands currently provide employment for agricultural management and the operation of a landfill.

Alternatives A & B - Land management activities on Gallatin County land and the State of Montana land are similar and would continue as is except for the location of future landfill activities, which would be expected to move south of current operations on land the County would receive in the exchange, if the exchange is executed, or west to county owned lands if the exchange is not approved. At the time Gallatin County Solid Waste District proposes landfill expansion, a MEPA evaluation will be required to address landfill activities and impacts specifically.

No notable change would be expected due to either land ownership alternative until such time as the land fill reaches capacity at the current 80acre site anticipated sometime in 2019

17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES:

Estimate tax revenue the project would create or eliminate. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to taxes and revenue.

These parcels are both owned by government entities and pay no taxes.

No notable change would be expected due to either land ownership alternative.

18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES:

Estimate increases in traffic and changes to traffic patterns. What changes would be needed to fire protection, police, schools, etc.? Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of this and other projects on government services

The parcels are currently managed in a manner like the management that would follow the proposal.

No notable change in government services would be expected.

19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS:

List State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, and other zoning or management plans, and identify how they would affect this project.

In 1972 the State of Montana sold an 80-acre easement to Gallatin County for the purpose of landfill operations on Township 1 North, Range 3 East, Section 6. In 2006 the State of Montana Leased 8.82 acres of land in Township 2 North, Range 2 East, Section 36 to Gallatin County to develop a scale house and office for administration of the landfill. The Trust Lands Division of the Department of Natural Resources and Conservation is charged with managing the State's trust lands for long term economic return to the trust.

In 2010 Gallatin county purchased the section of land adjacent to their landfill easement Township 1 North, Range 2 East, Section 1. The land was purchased to exchange with the State to accommodate expansion of the landfill on what is currently State ownership on Section 6 or to accommodate landfill expansion to the west when necessary.

Alternative A – Gallatin County Solid Waste District would evaluate future landfill expansion to the south and east of the current facilities and consolidate all landfill activities on the lands they would acquire through this exchange

The State of Montana would consolidate their ownership of 4 parcels and would gain access to 2 parcels that the State does not currently have access to facilitating future management opportunities.

Alternative B – Gallatin County would evaluate future landfill expansion on county owned lands to the west of their current facilities operated on state owned land.

The State of Montana would continue to manage their ownership without legal access and would not see the management benefits of land consolidation.

20. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES:

Identify any wilderness or recreational areas nearby or access routes through this tract. Determine the effects of the project on recreational potential within the tract. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to recreational and wilderness activities.

The State land in Section 6 has limited recreational value due to the lack of legal access. The County owned land in Section 1 is administered as part of the Gallatin Solid Waste Districts landfill ownership and the use is restricted.

Alternative A – The land to be acquired by the State would have legal access and through it would provide access to Section 12 directly to the south of it, which currently has no legal access. The location of the land the State would acquire is between 3 sections of State ownership which would create a large block of land available for recreation with a State Lands Recreational Use Permit. The land in Section 6 acquired by Gallatin County would be managed as restricted access as part of the landfill operations.

Concerns were raised that the exchange would provide legal access to Section 12 T1N R2E, which hasn't had access in the past. The concern was that it would affect the lessee's ability to use the parcel as they have in the past. New access will allow more public use of the parcel, that is one of the aspects of leasing State land.

Alternative B – The State land in Section 6 would continue to have limited recreational value due to access and Gallatin County's land in Section 1 would be managed as restricted access for landfill operations. The State would not gain access to section 12 south of Section 1.

21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING:

Estimate population changes and additional housing the project would require. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to population and housing.

No notable change would be expected due to either land ownership alternative.

22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES:

Identify potential disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities.

No notable change would be expected due to either land ownership alternative.

23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY:

How would the action affect any unique quality of the area?

The parcels are currently managed in a manner like the management that would follow the proposal.

No notable change would be expected.

24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:

Estimate the return to the trust. Include appropriate economic analysis. Identify potential future uses for the analysis area other than existing management. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative economic and social effects likely to occur as a result of the proposed action.

State Trust land, land exchanges are analyzed following the criteria in Land Exchange Policy. There are seven elements that must be addressed: The lands the State receives must be of equal or greater value, Have similar

navigable lake or stream values, provide equal or greater income to the trust, Consolidate State trust lands, have potential for long term appreciation, & provide improved or equal access to state or public lands.

The State of Montana and Gallatin County contracted an appraisal of the lands they were interested in exchanging and it was completed and reviewed on April 26, 2018. The State of Montana parcels Section 6, T1N, R3E consisting of 627.31 acres & Lot A, Minor Sub 403, Section 36, T2N, R2E consisting of 8.24 acres. these parcels were valued at \$602,000 and \$45,000 respectively. The County land Section 1 less 19 acres in the NE 1/4, T1N, R2E consisting of 615.49 acres was valued at \$708,000. Based on this appraisal the subject land meets the value requirements for exchange. (appraisal Summary attached)

Neither parcel has navigable lake or stream frontage.

Gallatin County has worked for the last 5 years to enhance the agricultural production of their parcel, this work has resulted in their parcel having similar production as the State parcels even though there is a commercial lease on the State's Section 36. The income value of the State land was calculated using current revenue data and deducting the cost of management. The State is receiving \$27.00 per AUM through a competitive bid on the grazing land.. The income potential of the Counties land has been calculated with the actual income currently produced on the parcel by considering a minimum bid using a 25% crop share of the 2016 winter wheat crop annualized for a crop fallow rotation, and the Counties Current AUM rate with their grazing lessee of \$22.58. Since both parcels are in such close proximity & they are at similar grazing rates it is reasonable to assume that the conditions for the parcels will remain the same and that the State could expect a competitive bid at least similar to the current rate that the County is receiving on their land now, therefore it is reasonable to use the Counties actual income model for the purpose of comparison. In the case of revenue to the State there is the ability for the proponent of the land exchange to address any inequity in the income by contributing cash to the general fund as an annuity to make up for a deficiency in income, this would require an annuity payment to the permanent fund to make up the difference of \$1,340.28 annually based on the chosen comparison of the actual current income potential of both parcels. A 20 year annuity calculated at the permanent funds 4.63% annual rate of return would require a one time payment of \$18,037.73 payable at closing.

If the State were to acquire Gallatin Counties land in Section 1, it would create a block of 4 State parcels that share a common boarder. Currently, the State has 4 parcels that meet at corners limiting access by the State and the Public.

Both lands are in near proximity to each other so the potential for appreciation of the parcels would be similar, with the exception that if traded the county parcel would be encumbered by a landfill and the parcel the state would receive has agricultural ground on it.

If the exchange were to proceed, the product would be 4 parcels of state land managed as one block all with public access. Current configuration of the 4 parcels of State land leave two without access, by the State or the public. Neither of the County parcels are currently managed for public access since they are considered part of the secure facility of the landfill, and if the exchange were to be executed the land that would transfer to the County would continue to be managed as restricted access for landfill operations.

As a final consideration, currently the State land is encumbered with a landfill under easement which will have ongoing affect on the value of the land in the future. . Gallatin County is the fastest growing county in the state and will certainly have a need to expand the landfill in the near future and ideally consolidate their activities. Exchange of these lands would accommodate the management needs for both parties.

EA Checklist

Name: Craig Campbell

Date: 7/11/2018

Prepared By:	Title: Bozeman Unit Manager
---------------------	------------------------------------

V. FINDING

25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:


Alternative A – Execute the land exchange with Gallatin County allowing both DNRC and the Gallatin Solid Waste District to consolidate their holdings and provide for improved management and access to their respective lands.

26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:

I have determined that none of the anticipated environmental impacts outlined in the EA are significant according to the criteria outlined in *ARM 36.2.524*. I find that no impacts are regarded as severe, enduring, geographically widespread, or frequent. Further, I find that exchanging these lands is both in the long term best interest of the State of Montana and Gallatin County.

27. NEED FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:

☐ EIS ☐ More Detailed EA ☒ No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Approved By:	Name: Martin Balukas
	Title: Trust Lands Program Manager, Central Land Office
Signature: 	Date: 8/2/18